

With 36.4 million elementary school-aged children and 16.8 million high school-aged children in our country, it is obvious that the science education they get today will dramatically affect their future tomorrow.

Thanks to advanced technologies, today's science classes are much more advanced than the ones I took when I was in school. Yet there are so many viewpoints out there on scientific subjects, especially climate change, it is sometimes difficult to present all views fairly to them. However, I feel that this is important, especially on an issue as sensitive and politically charged as global climate change.

Our children are our future, and we owe it to them to provide them with the best most balanced education possible. My amendment will help achieve that by presenting all viewpoints to students in kindergarten through 12th grade. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have long called for all scientific positions to be heard, and my amendment achieves this. I encourage all my colleagues to support this amendment and ensure that all students receive fair and balanced scientific education.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. BAIRD. I continue to reserve.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the sense of what the gentleman is raising with his second order amendment. Having taught science myself, I believe it is absolutely important to share different sides of it. My concern is I think you are sort of micromanaging the education process, however, positive your intent may be. And the gentleman himself just acknowledged that students from K-12 need to have balanced information.

I question whether we really want to mandate that a kindergarten teacher educate her or his students on the impact of greenhouse gases on U.S. energy security, global developing nations, et cetera.

I think it is a fair point and absolutely an important point that we present different sides of this issue, and I applaud the gentleman for raising that.

I would, however, note that the International Panel on Climate Change, which we have had two hearings of in this committee, has clearly unanimously agreed on some general principles: That the climate temperature is increasing; that humans are significantly responsible for at least a substantial portion of that increase; and, that it will have very important consequences for the well-being of the world.

So one of the problems I have is the gentleman's amendment would seem to suggest that there is an equal weight of evidence against that perspective as there is in favor of it. And I don't re-

call if the gentleman attended those two hearings, but if he did, I think it was pretty clear that scientists from around the world do not consider that there is an equal weight among those who might refute the evidence of global warming and the human causes thereof.

It is absolutely legitimate that we look at the pros and cons of the various strategies to remedy that; but to micromanage it in this way, which is not what the gentleman from California's initial amendment did, I think is a mistake. I certainly wouldn't want a kindergarten teacher who is trying to educate his or her students about the potential problems of global warming to say, "Oh, my goodness. I don't have in my curriculum for these 5-year-olds a lesson on the impact of greenhouse gas on developing nations or United States energy security." I think a kindergarten teacher might be much more likely to say, "Hey, kids the world is getting hotter. You and I and your folks can have a role in trying to reduce that problem, and it is in all of our best interests to do so."

I would hate to see a kindergarten teacher micromanaged like this, however well-intentioned the gentleman's amendment is. And I still reserve the point of order, but if we don't succeed in that, I certainly urge opposition to this at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, at this point I will withdraw the point of order, but I would urge opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. SULLIVAN) to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. WELDON OF FLORIDA

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 9 offered by Mr. WELDON of Florida:

In section 3(a)(1), strike "There" and insert "Except as provided in paragraph (3), there".

At the end of section 3(a), insert the following new paragraph:

(3) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), the total amount authorized to be appropriated under this subsection shall not exceed the amount actually appro-

priated for the Foundation for fiscal year 2007 if—

(A) the total amount appropriated for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 2008 is less than \$17,309,400,000;

(B) the total amount appropriated for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Exploration Systems for fiscal year 2008 is less than \$3,923,800,000; or

(C) the total amount appropriated for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Space Operations for fiscal year 2008 is less than \$6,791,700,000.

In section 3(b)(1), strike "There" and insert "Except as provided in paragraph (3), there".

At the end of section 3(b), insert the following new paragraph:

(3) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), the total amount authorized to be appropriated under this subsection shall not exceed the amount actually appropriated for the Foundation for fiscal year 2008 if—

(A) the total amount appropriated for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 2009 is less than \$17,614,200,000;

(B) the total amount appropriated for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Exploration Systems for fiscal year 2009 is less than \$4,312,800,000; or

(C) the total amount appropriated for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Space Operations for fiscal year 2009 is less than \$6,710,300,000.

In section 3(c)(1), strike "There" and insert "Except as provided in paragraph (3), there".

At the end of section 3(c), insert the following new paragraph:

(3) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), the total amount authorized to be appropriated under this subsection shall not exceed the amount actually appropriated for the Foundation for fiscal year 2009 if—

(A) the total amount appropriated for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 2010 is less than \$18,026,300,000;

(B) the total amount appropriated for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Exploration Systems for fiscal year 2010 is less than \$4,757,800,000; or

(C) the total amount appropriated for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Space Operations for fiscal year 2010 is less than \$6,625,700,000.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to reserve a point of order on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the authors of this piece of legislation, and make very clear that I am a strong supporter of the National Science Foundation. Indeed, I have an undergraduate degree in a science field, biochemistry. I did basic science research as an undergraduate, and I fully recognize the need for this country to make a significant increase in our investment in basic science research as the kind of research that comes through the National Science Foundation.

My concern before the committee today is that the National Science Foundation is in the same budget category as NASA; and already, the new majority this year has chosen to significantly cut funding to NASA.